

their past or future military service;

....the establishment of a National Volunteer Training Corps program, with the financial support and status hitherto accorded NROTC, for preparing young Americans for both international and domestic Peace Corps service;

....Federal aid to education, with money appropriated according to the need as defined by the original Kennedy Task Force rather than the inadequate sums proposed in the present bill.

Early Education. Studies of poverty more and more indicate that the social and psychological maiming of the children of the poor occurs at a very early age. Moreover, crowded, poorly staffed and inadequate urban and rural slum schools are often the transmission belt for functional illiteracy. A child who does not learn to read and write in the first three grades is marked as a dropout by the time he reaches eight or nine years.

We support:

....a Federal grant for nursery and pre-school care, particularly in slum areas;

....special Federal aid for reducing the teacher-student ration in the first three grades of school, and for remedial reading facilities.

New Definitions of Work. Part of the enormous problem of poverty in contemporary America is that technology is destroying precisely those skilled and semi-skilled jobs which were once the point of entry into the economy for immigrant and other impoverished groups. This shift in the shape of the American manpower system is a particularly grave burden for Negroes and other minorities who are denied the opportunities which this nation once provided to those at the bottom. With our present knowledge of the future of the labor market, it is clear that there are hundreds of thousands, even millions, who will be unemployable, or fit only for miserable under-employment, so long as our present definitions of work prevail.

We therefore propose that the United States recognize that the elimination of tedious and routine work can be a blessing, for it allows for new definitions of work. Specifically, in the automated economy, the growth industry for jobs is the human care of human beings, the one function which no machine can ever perform.

As a start, here and now, in acting on this principle, we propose a vast expansion of non- and semi-professional social work, and particularly those activities which will involve the poor themselves in the war against poverty. For example, we urge:

....the utilization of the skills of the aging, and particularly the aging poor, as part of the expansion of nursery and pre-school education;

....the employment of non-professionals as teacher's and social worker's aides;

....the recognition of non-fighting gangs in the slums as effective social agencies, with financial support to the groups and the possibility of payment to their officers as non-professional social workers;

....the creation of non-professional community service employment in public housing and neighborhood centers;

....the expansion of the "home town youth corps" program under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, with special relevance to the training of such volunteers in new types of social work.

CONCLUSION

These are some of the ideas which we socialists propose for the strategy and tactic of the war against poverty.

Whether viewed in terms of immediate reform or of the long range transformation of the society, each one of these proposals is related to the fundamental options of American life. The poor are only the most obvious victims of a technology which has mastered its creators and anarchically "planned" this nation. But the rest of the people of this country faces these problems as well. It is clearly possible to rescue those who have been left behind by economic progress; but, more than that, it is possible to rescue them in

HAMMER & TONGS

NUMBER 3

15 CENTS

DISCUSSION BULLETIN OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

SP-SDF
64 E. VAN BUREN
ROOM 810
CHICAGO 5, ILL.

CONTENTS:

Background Material Prepared For The Washington Conference On Poverty

An Alternative Approach To Minimum Wage Regulation.....Page 1
For Information: Swedish Economic Policy.....Page 3
Draft Ideas Submitted by Arlon Tussing.....Page 6

Foreign Policy Plank - First Draft

By David McReynolds.....Page 8

Letter To The Members

By David McReynolds.....Page 19

Socialism Reaffirmed

By Ken Burg and Mike Muench.....Page 25

ORDERS SHOULD BE SENT TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS. PLEASE INCLUDE PAYMENT.

AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH TO MINIMUM WAGE REGULATION

In 1939 there was agitation in Great Britain for a national minimum wage law. The proposal was rejected in favor of what was called the Trade Boards Act. It set up tripartite minimum wage fixing machinery for four named "sweated" trades, with exceptionally low wages. An important change was made in a 1918 Act which authorized the minister of labor to establish similar boards in any industry in which collective bargaining machinery did not exist, and broadened the subject matter which trade boards might deal with. Another act set up a similar mechanism in agriculture (administered by the Ministry of Agriculture), and subsequent legislation provided equivalent machinery for "the catering trades" (hotels, restaurants and domestic service).

In 1945 the Trade Boards were rechristened Wages Councils and the Minister of Labor was authorized to issue a "wages council order" in any industry where the voluntary machinery for setting wages and conditions of employment was not effective and comprehensive as well as in industries where collective bargaining was not being practiced.

Employer and employee representatives on the Wages Councils as well as the public or "independent" members are chosen by the government, but wherever there are representative bodies on either side they may nominate and their recommendations are usually accepted. Councils make their recommendations to the Minister who, after a period during which objections may be lodged, proclaims them as the minimum wages and conditions for all workers in the industries involved. An inspection and enforcement procedure is provided.

This statutory system of wage determination and enforcement is, and always has been, thought of as a supplement to, not a substitute for, collective bargaining. In some Wages Councils industries there is voluntary collective bargaining between the unions and the better employers, and the Councils' orders simply extend those bargains to the unorganized segments of the industries. In others the Wages Councils themselves amount to a negotiating forum with the public members playing the role of conciliators. If both sides agree that they have developed sufficiently comprehensive voluntary relations they may ask that the Council be abolished.

For the most part the Councils are in industries where the unskilled workers are on wage rates lower than the national average wage, and about 90 per cent of full-time female manual employment is covered. Most retail trades, food production and catering industries, hotels and lodging houses, hairdressing, some garment making, textile, toy, and paper manufacturing have Wages Councils - a list not too different from what one would expect to see emerge in the United States.

In addition to setting wages and conditions, the impact over the years of the Wages Councils has included an impetus to organization by both workers and employers, and generally a policing up of industries in which unethical practices were prevalent.

A POSITIVE LOOK AT AUTOMATION, including a plan to eliminate unemployment in the age of automation, by Edwin F. Shelley, Director, National Council on the Aging; Vice President, U. S. Industries, Inc. -- excerpts from a speech before the 13th Annual Meeting of the National Council on the Aging, February 12, 1964.

Therefore, to meet the national requirements of full employment and lifelong education I propose the establishment of a national system of Earned Educational Leave. Under present conditions of approximately 5% unemployment, one year of paid Educational Leave would be earned by every worker after 20 years of employment. Thus 5% of the labor force would be transferred from employment to education. The transfer each year of 5% of the employed labor force from employment to education would create a labor shortage throughout our economy. It would encourage an upward movement of employed workers to fill the voids in their respective companies, and it would open up the requisite number of appropriate jobs for the presently unemployed. I think we would find, as we found during and after World War II, that the retraining problems and the mobility problems would melt away before the great pressure of a labor shortage and the great motivation of an assured job.

In practice, 9 months of the one-year leave might be devoted to appropriate education and training, and 3 months to travel, recreation or leisure. I do not propose to suggest a curriculum, but I believe that the term EDUCATION should be interpreted in the broadest sense and should be appropriate to the adult in our society.

This investment in people--in their education, their training, their cultural up-grading--would unquestionably stimulate the growth of the economy. The buoyant atmosphere created by full employment would serve as further stimulant. Labor's fear of unemployment, and its distrust of technological improvement, would be replaced by confidence in the availability of jobs and in the opportunities for personal advancement. Under a system of Earned Educational Leave it would be to everyone's advantage to welcome improvement and to increase productivity, since the increase would be converted directly into more frequent Educational Leave. If the productivity index were to indicate a 5% labor surplus, as at present, then 20 years of service would earn one year of Educational Leave, and there would be, of course, no actual unemployment other than people in transit between jobs. If the productivity index rose to a level indicating, say, an 8% labor surplus, then only 12½ years of service would be required to earn one year of Leave. A still higher productivity index indicating a 10% labor surplus would result in a year of Educational Leave for every 10 years of service. Compare this with the devastating effect which a 10% labor surplus would have on our economy in the absence of an Educational Leave System.

I should like to make it clear that the proposed National Educational Leave System is not a substitute for such supplementary measures as public works, unemployment compensation and area redevelopment. The Educational Leave System, however, is an automatic, self-regulating system which can adjust itself to the variations of the economic and social climate. Whenever the increase in productivity outruns the increase in demand, each worker's Educational Leave becomes more frequent. Thus additional investment is automatically made in education and training, and this serves to sustain both the productivity level and the demand level. As the complexity of society grows, the total educational level rises, and in the process, the entire labor force is satisfactorily employed.

For Information: SWEDISH ECONOMIC POLICY

Under the social-democratic government of Sweden, there has been a determined effort to support a full employment economy, which has existed largely since 1938. All policies--tax, fiscal, wage and labor--are considered for their effect on this goal. All parties support these policies--even "conservative" economists in Sweden are far advanced over almost any American economist in their approach to planning for full employment.

FISCAL POLICY

By 1937 the principle of an annual balance was formally abandoned and a concept of balancing the budget over the cycle was accepted. Government spending and taxing are looked upon as a major instrument to help effect and maintain full employment, and to try to avoid inflation. In the period from 1955 to 1956 when some modest effort was being made to check the boom, the change in public expenditures which could be attributed to conscious public policy was a downward movement equal to about ½ of 1% of GNP. Between 1957 and 1958 when the government was countering a recession, it was able to directly effect a change, that is, increase public outlays in relation to revenue, equal to about 1% of GNP. Changes in the budget thus take on more importance than the level itself.

In 1951-52 and 1955-57 a direct tax on investment (12% in the latest year) was introduced to control the boom in business spending. It worked in discouraging some investment and seemed to have been more effective than mere increases in rates of interest and other restrictions of credit. The withdrawal of this tax in 1958 helped spur an increase in investment that year.

The Swedes have found more useful a system of investment resources which they instituted some years ago but which have been fully operative only since 1955. Under this system any firm can earmark an amount up to 40% of its profits before taxes in any year as such reserves. Once deposited they can only be invested with the consent of the Labor Market Board. Profits thus earmarked are exempt from taxation as long as they are used in accordance with these rules. If a firm withdraws its funds without authorization, they become subject to the original tax liability, plus an additional 10%. When a firm makes an approved investment, it can deduct 10% of the amount from taxable income in the year in which the investment is made. Reserves can be used to acquire land, buildings, equipment, inventories, workers' housing, or meet costs of repair and maintenance. In special cases they can be used to meet foreign marketing costs, and certain welfare programs for employees. Reserves remain on deposit for a maximum of five years, after which the firm is free to use 30% of its reserves each year without any liability for taxes.

The government has been able to influence a countercyclical movement of private investment (outside of dwellings). During the period of 1955-57, for example, at the start of the boom, private investment was stagnant. In 1958, one of the few recession years in postwar Swedish history, private investment rose 8% over the 1957 level, and it rose again in 1959 as the release of investment reserve funds continued to operate. The whole system has operated in the past few years to give encouragement to businessmen who now realize the reserves will be released to industry as promised. As a result, businessmen are now placing heavy funds in these reserves. To induce companies to participate they have been given the right to deduct from taxable income

in the year's state-tax assessment a sum equivalent to 12% of the reserve.

In late 1961 it seemed that the boom would over strain the economy; rather than add to general measures, such as investment taxation or investment reserves, or apply too much credit restraint, the government took an additional new step. Meeting with the top Employers' Federation, it reached an agreement with them whereby they would voluntarily reduce their planned investments in building and machinery especially during the summer (winter has been a chronic slack period in Sweden) to help ease the pressures in the economy.

LABOR MARKET BOARD - RETRAINING, RELOCATION, HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS

Government officials and economists draw the following general outline:

To reduce and keep unemployment down to 3-4% of the labor force it is wise and necessary to keep general demand in the economy very strong and active; to reduce unemployment from 3-4% to 2%, resort is had to retraining, anticipating shortages and surpluses, moving workers at government expense, and the use of special public works programs. In May, 1961, the Swedish unemployment figure was 1.2% against 6.7% in the United States.

The Swedish labor market, on the government's side, is administered by the Labor Market Board. The Board is an autonomous arm of the Ministry of Social Affairs. It consists of a director-general, his deputy, and 8 members appointed by the government of whom 4 represent labor (2 from the Federation of Blue-Collar Unions and 1 each from the professional and white-collar federations), 2 industry, and 2 the public. It operates a state employment service and separate divisions devoted to industrial location, vocational rehabilitation, and vocational guidance. Unemployment insurance is administered in Sweden through organizations close to the trade unions and subsidized from national funds.

The Board's first line of defense is to encourage labor mobility. It engages in constant study of manpower development and employment patterns, directed at predictions of employment levels overall, by occupation and by area over both the short and long run.

Training courses are provided for workers unemployed or facing the prospect of unemployment. There are three basic types: first courses for beginners, advanced training, and retraining for adults who must for some reason change their livelihood. The latter are the most numerous by far. Benefits include tuition, rental and living allowances--at about 70% of earnings--and family supplements where required. Other costs--work clothes, travel allowances, etc.--are provided when necessary. Retraining is available to all workers regardless of age. The typical training length is from 6 to 8 months, and 80% are usually employed on completion of training.

Training is supplemented by a special program actually offering employment. Office filing and similar work in government offices are provided for superannuated clerks and handicapped workers and others. Out door maintenance in parks, beaches, etc. is also offered. Special shops are set up where handicapped workers are employed. About half of those who take jobs in these work shops are able to leave them within a year for regular employment elsewhere.

The Board each year brings up to date an inventory of public works and supplies to be purchased for government agencies in forthcoming years. This is a public investment reserve, for use if necessary to combat unemployment. Clothing and textile purchases, for example, were stepped up in 1958-59.

Assistance to workers moving to other places to take new jobs is either by interest-free loan or by grant--mostly the latter. There is no means test. Assistance includes travel expenses and per diem to the worker and his family, starting allowance until the first pay check, family allowance if the family remains temporarily behind, and moving costs. Travel costs are met for a worker to visit the place where a new job exists even though he is free not to except it. The family allowance is normally for six months, and can be extended to one year if necessary; it includes both rent and a contribution to living expenses.

Board helps to provide housing for workers in areas where industry is expanding--and workers are moving--a direct financing of housing, by sharing the costs of local government, by stimulating subsidies for housing, and by securing priorities in existing housing.

In addition to its area studies, and recommendations to industry and local government about where new industries and new government installations ought to locate, the Board can act to influence location of new investments, since it can make recommendations regarding loan guarantees for investment purposes. It is the same Labor Market Board which makes the critical decisions on when and how the business investment reserves are to be released.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

I suggest that we abandon the confusing and misleading demand for a full employment policy, and raise instead the much more radical demand, the right of every American from 18 to 65 to a job. We should demand a Federal Law to this effect, and propose a program to implement it. The demand itself is concrete and unambiguous, and all arguments against it are either cynically unsympathetic to the plight of the "other America," or they are stuffy and technical, or both. While every detail does not need to be spelled out, we can propose a concise and non-technical program to abolish unemployment. I feel that the program below meets these needs; the demands are stated in logical order rather than in their order of political importance:

I. AN EFFECTIVE JOB-FINDING SERVICE. The USES is far less effective than it might be. The number of "frictionally" unemployed, that is, those who are "between" jobs, is scandalously high. It is generally assumed to be about 3% of the labor force in the U.S., in contrast to less than 1% in Western Europe and Japan. Among industrialized countries only the U.S.S.R.'s employment service is worse (it has none). A serious attempt to provide jobs for everyone requires someone to know what vacancies exist and where they are. Only a tiny fraction of jobs are listed with the Employment Service, and they are almost always the worst. The first step then is to require that all job vacancies, their qualifications and pay, be listed with the Employment Service. With modern information handling systems, there is no reason a worker could not walk into an employment office anywhere and within a few minutes have a report on any and all jobs for which he is qualified anywhere in the country.

II. RETRAINING, RETIREMENT, RELOCATION. After (say) six weeks of unemployment, compensated in much the same fashion as present unemployment benefits, a worker would be able to choose between:

- a. retirement on full Social Security benefits for workers over 50 who are unable to find suitable work in their local labor markets,
- b. relocation at government expense (cash grants and/or long term loans) for workers who can find jobs which require moving. The Employment Service might also assist the worker in selling his old house and in finding suitable housing at his destination,
- c. retraining at government expense, plus subsistence and family allowances during training, for any occupation in which there are openings, and for which an aptitude test shows him trainable. There is no reason this privilege should not include remedial education for those in need of it, or university training for those who can profitably use it, as well as more narrowly "vocational" training. All apprenticeship programs with openings and other private training opportunities would be listed with the Service in the same way as with job openings.

III. PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT. The remainder of the unemployed, those who cannot find any job for which they are qualified, and who can not for any reason be retrained or relocated, would be guaranteed public employment on projects to be established locally for this purpose. Such projects would supplement, but not replace, such programs as the proposed Youth Conservation Corps or Domestic Peace Corps

These workers would be paid the legal minimum wage, making it the absolute income floor for every person willing to work. I suggest a program conditional upon local participation with a 90% Federal share and a 10% State share (cities and counties could participate if the States rejected the program or failed to act). The projects on which the workers are to be employed would be chosen and administered locally by committees including labor representatives. This provision, with the matching funds feature, would undoubtedly make the program more attractive to the socially backward communities which need it most, but from whose ruling cliques most of the opposition will come. The fight over joining the program to get the 90% Federal share (and, of course, the non-discrimination and the minimum standards to be enforced) would realign the politics of a Southern town rapidly.

SIDE EFFECTS

A program like this would have many virtuous side effects. By providing jobs or training rather than unemployment benefits of relief payments to the unemployed, we can minimize the demoralizing effect of long unemployment which now makes a man out of work for a year or two psychologically unemployable for the rest of his life. It reassures the puritans among the middle class and among workers that their taxes are not being used to support "chiselers". (The number of unemployment and relief chiselers is very small but they are a big element in the psychology of opposition to social insurance.) It makes for a better allocation of labor, and for that reason will increase productivity. It provides a strong incentive for workers to improve their competitive position via education, and is a beginning of the principle that everyone is entitled to as much education as he is capable of using.

Above all, each of the items in the program is clearly and directly addressed to the problems of unemployment. The fiscal weapon is still used, because spending on training programs, pensions, and public employment will vary directly with the level of unemployment in the private economy. If inflation becomes a problem, it can be fought by monetary methods without the fear that tight money will cause mass unemployment. To the extent that anti-inflation policy would cause layoffs in industry, it would provide an impetus for retraining and relocation, which would increase productivity

FOREIGN POLICY PLAN - FIRST DRAFT by
David McReynolds

In less than a century the revolutionary changes in communication and transportation have made the world a small place indeed. The line between domestic and foreign policy becomes ever more difficult to draw as the nations and peoples of the planet become ever more closely dependent upon one another. Particularly with the development of nuclear energy, foreign policy determines not only our relations with peoples we once considered distant, but may well determine whether we and our children shall live or shall perish utterly.

From its inception as a political philosophy, socialism has been international. The Socialist Party of the United States is proud to be a member of the international democratic socialist movement, tied by the closest fraternal bonds to fellow socialists around the world. Any socialist discussion of foreign policy, therefore, is directed not only at those steps we propose for our own nation; but also at socialist parties and their members in other countries.

Three great forces shape world events today. These are: the technological revolution; the rise of totalitarianism, seen both in fascism and in communism; and the wave of national and social revolutions directed at colonial powers or at exploitative social orders. Of these three forces, by far the most important is the technological revolution. The technological development of nuclear weapons by the major powers, and the probable spread of these weapons to smaller powers, threatens the survival of the entire race every day such weapons remain in existence. The struggle against war is not any longer a noble or humanitarian cause. It is a necessary struggle ~~against~~ for all men and women who believe in human life and seek to make possible mankind's continued development. Any serious political program today must be oriented toward peace above all else, since peace is the precondition for any other social changes we may seek.

The problem of the absolute totalitarian state is one new to mankind, and made possible by technological developments which permitted, for the first time, central governments to observe and control virtually all aspects of the lives of tens of millions of persons. Americans, representing as they do a "status quo" power, have tended to confuse totalitarianism with revolution. The Russian experience under Lenin and Stalin does indeed show that revolutionary movements, no matter how sincerely launched, cannot escape the social context within which they occur, nor are they immune to the virus of totalitarianism. But the most monstrous tyranny of our time was that of Hitler, hardly a Communist, who enjoyed for a long period of time support from major industrial and political figures in the West (including the United States) who hoped he might serve as a bulwark against communism.

Totalitarianism is not inherent in revolutions, but flows from the anxieties of our age, from the alienation of the great urban masses, from the breakdown of old social and cultural patterns. In short, it flows from the conditions brought about by the industrial and technological revolution. Socialists reject totalitarianism. It was on this issue that we broke with the communist movement. It was on this issue that so many thousands of our members were executed first by Hitler and then, in Eastern Europe, by Stalin. Socialists have always pointed out that without food and shelter the word "freedom" is without meaning. However it is equally true that man does not live by bread alone. The socialist goal is the total revolution: the uniting of freedom with justice. Therefore we express our solidarity with our fellow socialists in underdeveloped nations as they seek to carry their revolutionary movements to the final and ultimate step of assuring personal freedom as well as securing social justice.

That same industrial and technological revolution which makes war so deadly, which makes totalitarian regimes to horribly possible, also makes inevitable the process of ~~industrial~~ national and social revolutions, the third dominant factor of world events. No modern industrial power can function without an educated working class. No colonial power can rule its colonies without armies of trained "natives" to act as clerks. The worker, educated and centralized in the cities, becomes unionized and political. Former factory hands become political figures, running parties and governments. The "native clerks" who made possible the vast colonial empires become "subtle agents of subversion", returning from European schools to carry doctrines of equality, of justice, and of socialism to their colonial homelands. Even the contemporary totalitarian states are not immune to this process of social revolution, as we have seen by observing the shifts and changes within Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

Social revolution is the closest thing we can find to an inevitable pattern in the world today. War is possible but it is not inevitable. Totalitarianism exists but it can be over come. The real question is whether the process of social change will be able to follow democratic and peaceful paths or will be diverted into violence, tyranny, and bureaucratic forms. In large part the answer to this question lies with the West. Historically the West is genuinely related to a belief in freedom, but this belief has increasingly been subordinated to the frantic effort to turn back the tide of social revolution, to defend and preserve the status quo from those very forces the West set in motion. The unspeakable horror of the Stalinist period, in which millions lost their lives and an entire generation of Russians and East Europeans grew up under the shadow of police terror, was historically related not only to the tradition of political absolutism of Russia, or to the implicit anti-democratic theories of Lenin and Trotsky, but, also, to the vigorous efforts of the West through military and economic sanctions to crush the young Bolshevik regime. Stalin was partly a product of the blind fears of the West.

One may say that objectively the Stalinists had no greater ally in their building the Communist Bloc than the reactionary forces of the West, which everywhere tried to block social revolutions and in consequence forced some of them, in weakness and in frustration, to turn to Communism. Our concentration on armaments, our false belief that Communism was largely a military threat, our willingness to dub the most miserable tyrant a member of the "Free World" so long as he was anti-Communist -- all of these are factors in the foreign policy of the past. It is a kind of political miracle that Russia did not win the Cold War, in view of the antagonism of the United States toward social revolutions in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

One of the ironies of this period is that it turns out both Russia and the United States have lost the Cold War and, in consequence, there is a momentary pause in world events, a shifting of forces -- and the possibility of real achievements for peace, for justice, and for freedom. The factor which brought the political and economic imperialisms of both major blocs to a halt has been the intensity of nationalism in newly emergent states -- a nationalism which both East and West underestimated. The Extreme Right is correct in pointing to the areas of U.S. defeat: China, Cuba, Algeria, Egypt, Ghana, etc. But from a Soviet standpoint things have been equally dismal. If that phase of our history in which we controlled Latin America was brought to a dramatic close by the Cuban Revolution, it is also true that beginning with the Yugoslav defection in 1948 the Russians have seen their control of Eastern Europe steadily slip. Far from being able to penetrate further into Europe, Russia has had a difficult time holding political hegemony over East Europe. The Berlin uprising of June 17,

(10)
1953, the heroic Hungarian Revolution and the political shifts in Poland in October, 1956, the breaking away of Albania from Soviet control, the newly established "Communist neutrality" of Rumania, and, above all else, the break with China -- these have been profound defeats for Soviet policy. Nor have these defeats occurred only in Eastern Europe or China, for if the West lost its grip on Egypt, Algeria, and Africa, Russia has found herself painfully rebuffed by these same states, which with one hand take massive Soviet aid and with the other hand outlaw their local Communist parties.

If the policies pursued by the United States during the past seventeen years have been failures, how great is our folly to continue to pursue these policies now, at a time when they have not only been repeatedly proven dangerous as well as ineffective but at a time when the entire world situation is deeply changed. It is in this light that we set forth our points on foreign policy. If we appeal to our fellow Americans for basic changes in our foreign policy, and if we direct that appeal also to our fellow socialists elsewhere in the world, and even to dissident elements within the various Communist parties, it is not because socialists seek, as so often charged, to blend a little of Western concern for freedom with a little of the Communist concern for social justice, producing a kind of "moderate middle way" with bits and pieces and freedom and justice thrown inadequately together.

The position of democratic socialists is not a halfway house between capitalism and Communism, as our enemies charge and as our friends sometimes seem to believe. Socialism is the path toward genuine social revolution. If we are unwilling to execute our opponents, this does not make us less revolutionary but more so. Revolutions are to be judged not by the blood they can spill (if that were the criteria, Hitler would be the foremost revolutionary of all time) but by the lives they can save. Socialism is the door into a future where freedom and social justice exist together fully, rather than only partially and imperfectly as is presently the case with both capitalism and communism. We know that without freedom there can be no true social justice. Without social justice there can be no vital sense of freedom. Socialists do not set one goal against the other, but act in such a way that both may be fulfilled. Our foreign policy is directed toward such a fulfillment.

DISARMAMENT AND THE UNITED NATIONS

We call for total, universal disarmament down to a police level, with inspection and control by a strengthened United Nations. We call for an immediate end of all further production of nuclear weapons by the United States and for the immediate dismantling of all factories producing bacteriological and chemical weapons. We call for an immediate cut in the arms budget by 25%, with the money saved to be directed into the domestic and international war on poverty, and with additional cuts to be made in following years.

There are a wide range of "unilateral initiatives" which the U.S. government can undertake without any serious threat to its present military power. These initiatives, some of which we have already listed, would create a situation where Russia would be forced into a "peace" race, and would have to match our steps with steps of her own. Other initiatives include the final abandoning of that madness known as Civil Defense, a program which it was clear from the beginning was a gigantic fraud on the public, without value in saving lives but dangerous in that it helped create a false sense of security and thus could permit or even encourage an extremist foreign policy. We could end our present program of conscription and call upon all nations everywhere to follow our example by abolishing their conscript armies.

(11)
In specific areas of foreign policy such as Cuba, China, Eastern Europe, there are very clear steps we can take which will be spelled out shortly. We do not rely upon Soviet goodwill to make these unilateral steps effective. We rely upon the hard political reality of a world which is weary of war and the threat of war, of a Russian population which knows with horrible precision what war means -- these are the forces which would make it necessary for the Soviet government to follow an American lead toward launching a peace race.

But even if all these steps were to fail, we would then say that since the use of nuclear weapons is unthinkable but since, however, their possession makes their use possible, we must proceed to the unilateral dismantling of American nuclear power, whether or not any other nation followed suit. In the final analysis no decent society can be preserved from destruction or decay by the balance of terror. In the nuclear age we must look to new methods of defense -- we must seriously examine the concept of nonviolence which spurred the liberation of India under Gandhi's leadership and which has been the weapon of the American Negro in his struggle to liberate this nation from the stain of racism.

As we seek to end the long nightmare of the arms race we have no better instrument at hand than the United Nations. We fully endorse the U.N. both as a world forum and, more importantly, as a functioning institution which gradually replaces the dangerous concept of absolute national sovereignty. It is all the more important that the U.N. have wide public support now, for it is under increasing attack from those Western powers which, having created it as an instrument for Western policy, now find it to be "dangerously independent." We rejoice at this independence, at the fact that neither the Soviet Bloc nor the American Bloc can be certain of a majority. We rejoice that the newer nations now hold the balance of power within the U.N. and have shown themselves able and willing to act as a restraint on both the Soviet Union and the United States.

INDUSTRIALIZATION OF UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Any discussion of industrialization raises a broad problem, one that involves virtually all the nations in Africa and Asia and most of those in Latin America. It is the problem of how an impoverished and industrially underdeveloped nation can deal with the new horror of starvation and extreme poverty. Socialists maintain that a democratic approach to economic planning, in which a balance is kept between the production of consumer goods (such as medicine, housing, schools) and the production of heavy industrial machinery, will make it possible to achieve an industrialized society without a totalitarian regime, particularly if the nation involved is not expending funds on building a military establishment. The net rate of industrial growth each year might well be less under a socialist as opposed to a communist government, but such non-material "goods" as freedom and cultural stability can be better maintained. Totalitarian regimes make remarkable strides forward in certain areas of the national life, but such strides are made possible by truly unbearable agony imposed on a large number of people for a long period of time. It is an error for any industrially underdeveloped nation to worship machine tools and other heavy industrial equipment to such an extent that the people as a whole must suffer extreme hardship to fulfill the dreams of the political leaders.

It is also true, however, that no heavily populated nation can adequately feed, clothe and house its population without developing the industrial sector of its economy. In many underdeveloped areas it is extremely doubtful if such a "great leap" in industrial capacity is possible without either (1) a totalitarian regime which can finance such development by underpaying the workers and peasants i.e., essen-

tionally by forced labor, or (2) substantial amounts of capital investment from outside of the country. At a time when foreign aid is so sharply under attack, socialists urge even greater economic aid be voted for building the industrial capacity of the emergent nations. In urging such foreign aid we make two very emphatic demands. First, such aid must be channeled through the United Nations, both to strengthen the UN, and also to insure that it is not used as a "political whip". Second, we take sharp issue with those who feel private investment can meet these needs. Private investment in underdeveloped countries does not build up the economies of the countries involved, but historically serves as a siphon by which foreign investors can bleed a poor nation of its natural resources.

THE AMERICAS

The Alliance for Progress, while announced with great fanfare, has failed to make headway against the problems of Latin America. The total funds invested each year (from U.S. government sources, U.S. private investors, and from Latin American investors) in developing the economy of Latin America has not even kept pace with capital flowing out of the area, nor has it kept pace with the population expansion. With few exceptions, the population of Latin America is incredibly poor, illiterate, and ruled by a small class of wealthy, corrupt and anti-democratic elements. Such elements have no interest in the social reforms so desperately needed. It is clear that, without swift and major changes in most of the nations of Latin America, there will be violent revolutionary upheavals which neither the C.I.A. nor the State Department nor even the United Fruit Company can control or prevent. Time is running out in Latin America.

The U.S. government has protested (quite properly) against Castro's government shipping small quantities of arms to revolutionaries in other countries in Latin America. Yet the U.S. government continues to send massive quantities of arms into Latin America to uphold reactionary, anti-human oligarchies. We call for the absolute end of military aid to Latin America. We condemn and oppose all dictatorships in Latin America, whether by civilian or military juntas, whether of the "left" or of the "right." We favor a great expansion of economic aid to those countries already engaged in significant social reforms -- Costa Rica, Venezuela, Bolivia, Uruguay, Mexico. Most particularly we declare our solidarity with and our full support for the efforts of democratic revolutionary and socialist parties, movements, and trade unions. We urge the AFL-CIO to aid these organizations without political conditions that would discriminate against revolutionary democratic socialist groups.

CUBA:

No socialist can view Cuba without a sense of the tragedy involved in the Cuban Revolution. U.S. policy toward Cuba, our determination that Cuba would continue to have a "special relationship" with the U.S. including our right to maintain a military base on Cuban soil, made it inevitable that a Revolution which began without the aid of the Communists (and was, in fact, opposed by them), would finally be forced to turn to Russia for the military and economic aid necessary to defend the Cuban Revolution against ceaseless U.S. hostility. But in the process of turning to the Communist Bloc and, within Cuba, relying so heavily upon the Communist Party, the Revolution has been profoundly warped. Cuba is today a police state and as such has betrayed the original goal of the Revolution to bring freedom to the Cuban people.

However we recognize that conditions, however, tragic, are considerably better than under Batista. All evidence indicates Dr. Castro continues to enjoy the support of the Cuban people and non-Communist elements continue to play a major role within the government.

We sharply condemn all efforts by the Castro government to export

violent revolution. We must be equally sharp in condemning the open attempts by the U.S. to export violent counter-revolution into Cuba. Few episodes of U.S. history are as morally shameful as our treatment of Cuba since 1959. We have, in attempting to overthrow the Castro government, violated solemn international treaties, tried to block legitimate trade between Cuba and other nations, tried to limit or ban altogether the shipment of food and medicines into Cuba, successfully established an "Iron Curtain" around Cuba to prevent U.S. citizens from traveling to that island, allied ourselves with discredited remnants of the Batista regime in an effort to invade Cuba, and in general have been guilty of disgraceful duplicity in applying standards to Cuba (in terms of free elections, etc.) which we have never applied to those nations allied with us (Spain, Portugal, Taiwan, etc.).

We are deeply sympathetic to those democratic elements among the Cuban refugees. With them we would hope to see the fulfillment of Castro's pledge of political freedom. But in the existing situation all efforts at the violent overthrow of the Castro government can only result in its being replaced by a far worse regime. We call for normal diplomatic and trade relations between the U.S. and Cuba. We favor the restoration of the U.S. quota for purchase of Cuban sugar. We call for withdrawal from Guantanamo, base which not only has no military value but which was extorted from the Cubans at a time when we occupied the island in 1901.

PANAMA:

It is common knowledge the Panama Canal was obtained by force of American arms. The determination of the United States to retain exclusive property rights in the Canal Zone is as outmoded as the British attempt to hold on to the Suez Canal. We call for surrendering the Canal Zone to the Panamanian people, with the understanding that Panama will agree through international treaty to recognize the uniquely international character of the Canal and the impossibility of any single nation claiming total sovereignty.

CANADA:

We declare our opposition to the stationing of nuclear weapons on Canadian soil and express our solidarity with the New Democratic Party and with all those elements in Canada opposed to seeing Canada used to meet the military needs of the U.S.

ASIA

CHINA: The peoples Republic of China dominates Asian affairs, not only by the sheer weight of population and by its geographical location, but by reason of the aggressive and imperialist nationalism which characterizes present Chinese policy. China, not content to co-exist with her neighbors, has at various times sought to expand her influence into Indo-China, India, and the Asian territories of the Soviet Union. It would be easy to argue, as many in the West do (including the Soviets), that world civilization is menaced by a "Yellow Peril." It is tragic that we should leap almost eagerly to see the ancient culture of China in this light without first attempting to modify her policy by examining errors and mistakes of our own.

We forget that, if China sought the military unification of Korea, that goal was first attempted by the United States, which used the occasion of the Civil War in 1950 to attempt the military conquest of North Korea. If China claims the West is hostile, she has good reason for this belief. The American seventh Fleet protects Chiang KaiShek from retaliation for his hit and run attacks along the Chinese coast. That same fleet denies China possession of Quemoy and Matsu -- clearly Chinese property, lying within shouting distance of the mainland. Until recently the C.I.A. flew military supplies into Burma where they were dropped by parachute to Chinese Nationalist rebels who used Burmese territory as sanctuary from which to attack China (until Burma

threatened to break diplomatic relations with the U.S. unless the air drops were stopped). U.S. troops are fighting in South Vietnam, almost on the Chinese border, trying to maintain a U.S. puppet government. The U.S. not only refuses to recognize the government of China but has successfully led the Western powers in blocking China's admission to the U.S. The Chinese are a proud people with a civilization dating back thousands of years before the West even had a written language. Western attitudes have served to inflame a traditional Chinese nationalism.

We are absolutely opposed to all efforts by the Chinese to shift and change her borders by military action. We condemn her border conflict with India. We condemn her brutal occupation of Tibet. We are, as socialists, resolutely opposed to Chinese efforts to subvert neighboring states, turning them into part of a new Chinese sphere of influence, just as we have opposed U.S. and Soviet attempts to subvert governments bordering them.

But the cause of peace will best be served if these and other matters can be placed before the U.N. -- something which is quite impossible until we admit China to her rightful place in the Security Council as well as the General Assembly. We urge the recognition of the Chinese government by the U.S. State Department. We urge trade with China. We demand the relinquishment of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese, to whom they rightfully belong. There could be no greater folly than to permit reactionary forces in the United States to repeat in Asia the bankrupt policies we used in the past against the Soviet Union. It is in our interest to see the Chinese people industrialize as swiftly as possible, for the Russian experience has shown the great difficulty which totalitarians have in preserving a totalitarian structure in a society which has developed an industrial base, with the working class and the technicians required to make such a society function. The long range goal of Western policy should be to end the attempt to isolate China from world events and to aid the internal development of China along industrial and technological lines.

TAIWAN

Taiwan was never historically attached in any real sense to the Chinese Empire, but has been independent. The Yalta agreements ceding Taiwan to Chiang Kai Shek were not a concession to historic facts, but to Chiang's expansionist policy. Chiang had no legitimate claim to Taiwan in 1945 nor has the Chinese government today any better claim to it. We reject also the theory that the Chinese Nationalist government has any claim to Taiwan, an island it holds by sheer police state methods which have made it impossible for the native population to openly express its opposition to Chiang and the Chinese Nationalists. We do not accept a "Two Chinas" theory. There is only one China and there is Taiwan. Who should represent Taiwan in the U.N. General Assembly can be decided only after a U.N. supervised free election in which the Taiwanese (as distinct from the occupying force of Chinese Nationalists who came to Taiwan only within the past fifteen years) can vote whether they wish to unite with the mainland, whether they wish to resume their ties to Japan, or whether they wish to be independent. American military forces must not be used to protect the totalitarian and illegitimate Chiang regime, but should be used only through the United Nations to assure the population of Taiwan the right of self-determination.

INDO CHINA

In 1954, after several years of bitter fighting in which a French army numbering some 400,000 men suffered casualties of 175,000 (and inflicted far heavier casualties upon the Indo Chinese), and after more than two billion dollars of American military aid had been poured in, France finally withdrew from Indo China, and, at Geneva, signed treaties creating the new states of Laos, Cambodia, and North and South Vietnam out of the former French territory of Indo China. The treaty stipulated

that within two years there would be free elections in North and South Vietnam to unify the Vietnamese. The United States agreed to respect the terms of the Geneva Accords.

The South Vietnamese government (with French and U.S. backing) refused to hold free elections, fearing that the Communists would win, whereupon a Communist led resistance movement, the Viet Cong, began open attacks to gain control of South Vietnam. Some 15,000 American troops are now in South Vietnam, in direct violation of the Geneva accords, and have been instructing the Vietnamese in barbaric methods of warfare, including the establishment of concentration camps, the poisoning of water supplies, the use of torture, and the machine gunning and napalm bombing of villages in Communist held areas. The U.S. record in Vietnam is now both more bloody and more barbaric than the Soviet record in Hungary when it murderously suppressed the 1956 Revolution.

We are supporting a government which has never been elected. We are waging a war which military experts know we cannot win. We are attempting to replace the French influence in Indo China with an American influence, and do not seem to understand that the Chinese will not permit an American puppet state to exist almost on their very border, and are prepared, if necessary, to commit men and material to insure the defeat of the American-backed government. Thus far, ironically, the Viet Cong is operating not with Russian or Chinese equipment, but almost entirely with American equipment, captured from South Vietnamese troops or brought by those troops to the Viet Cong when they desert the American backed South Vietnamese army.

China has at various times in the past indicated a willingness to see a neutralized net of states to her South: Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos. In Laos, where the Americans, the Russians and the Chinese are all involved (but where the Laotians themselves are quite passive toward all three sides), it was the C.I.A. which created the present chaos when it attempted to overthrow a neutralist regime (again, in violation of international treaties) and to replace it with an American puppet state. In Cambodia, which has no problem of Communist insurrection, the government has openly accused the C.I.A. of attempting to overthrow it, and U.S. military "advisors" were present, in at least one case, in an armed attack by South Vietnamese on a Cambodian village in which a number of Cambodian civilians were killed.

We unreservedly condemn the interference by any outside power, Chinese, Russian, or U.S., in the affairs of the Indo Chinese states. We urge that efforts be made to secure, if possible, the neutralization of North and South Vietnam and to insure the neutrality of Laos and Cambodia. We urge efforts be made for free elections in North and South Vietnam, through the UN, to secure the unification of these two areas. But in any event we demand the immediate withdrawal of American military "advisors", and the absolute end of all further American military aid to South Vietnam. We would be able to condemn more vigorously the terrorists methods used by the Viet Cong if the Americans were not responsible for torture, terror and death exceeding anything the Communist side has inflicted in South Vietnam. American policy in the Indo Chinese area is militarily impractical, politically foolish, and morally criminal.

INDIA:

American socialists take a special interest in India and feel a special relationship to our comrades there, not only because the Indian policy of non-alignment helped, over the years, to maintain some degree of sanity in world affairs and was instrumental in closing down the worst phase of the Cold War, but, more urgently, because India may well prove to be the great test of the democratic versus the totalitarian path. India, despite failing at many points, and in the midst of problems which others might easily use as justification for totalitarianism, has maintained a democratic approach.

With all due respect to Nehru, we especially salute our comrades in India who continue to strive to build a genuine democratic and radical opposition to the corrupt and conservative Congress Party. The Nehru government, despite many major achievements -- to deal with the land hunger of the peasants, or to achieve a rate of industrial growth which can more than keep pace with the population expansion. Indian socialists have a heavy task ahead of them, as they seek to move beyond the Gandhian Revolution, which brought India her freedom but was essentially a national revolution, to the next step of a far-reaching social revolution in which industrial development, economic planning, and political freedom must be woven together into a new pattern. If India can, despite her enormous problems, succeed in this task, then she will light the way not only for Asia, but will have taught the West yet another lesson, among the many which we have had over the centuries from this profound and ancient civilization.

AFRICA:

Many of the problems of Africa are similar to those encountered in South America or Asia. But Africa also has unique problems, particularly in trying to establish viable economies and building nations out of the complexity of tribalism and the confusion created by the artificial borders set up by the colonial powers. With the exception of the British, the colonial powers are at fault for providing little or no training in self-government. One reason for the chaos in the Congo was the almost total lack of college graduates among the Congolese -- a direct result of the blind policy followed by Belgium. Despite all these problems, Africa has shown its ability to produce outstanding leaders such as Kenneth Kaunda and Julius Nyerere, and to move from colonialism to freedom with far less violence and confusion than might rightfully have been expected.

Socialists are discouraged over developments in Ghana and elsewhere, where the trend is toward absolute one-party rule with a denial of any effective freedom for political opponents. But in general the record is good. Even in Algeria, where we are unhappy at limits upon political freedom, the government of Ben Bella has made significant strides toward building a meaningful social revolution out of the debris left by seven years of war.

The major problem of Africa is, of course, the violent racism and fascism of the Union of South Africa and the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique. We have for years warned that the Union of South Africa and the government of Portugal were making a nonviolent resolution of the problem increasingly difficult. Such a nonviolent resolution now seems impossible. Revolutionary military centers are now operating in various parts of Africa, training and equipping volunteers for military action within South Africa, Angola and Mozambique. Such violent activities are certain to increase with the passage of time. Since all nonviolent means of change have been made illegal in these areas, we must declare our moral support for those revolutionary elements seeking, even by means of violence, to overthrow the government of South Africa and to drive the Portuguese from Angola and Mozambique. But we give such support without enthusiasm, for we know the innocent on both sides will suffer, and we know that a violent upheaval makes it more difficult to establish new governments in these areas on a democratic basis. We plead with the nations of the world to hasten the liberation of these areas, thus minimizing the agony through which these areas will otherwise pass.

We call for a total world wide boycott on trade with South Africa and Portugal. We demand an absolute embargo on the shipment of military supplies to these countries. While we cannot agree with those African states that seek the expulsion of Portugal and South Africa from the U.N., for we believe membership in the U.N. must be universal, we strongly urge the full moral weight of the U.N. be cast openly and relentlessly against the Union of South Africa and the government of Portugal.

EUROPE:

The pattern of events in Europe has been changing swiftly in recent years. In the event of an election victory this fall by the British Labor Party we hope for a new sense of realism by the NATO powers in regard to Eastern Europe and in regard particularly to the question of German rearmament.

It is an illusion for European socialists to believe that a firm alliance with the United States, which is the cause of socialism within Europe. We urge the ~~xxxxx~~ socialist parties of Europe to follow a political course sharply independent of the American government. DeGaulle, in a negative way, has already shown the great influence that lesser powers can have if they will determine their own policies. If DeGaulle has achieved new influence for France despite such military idiocies as his projected nuclear force, how much greater would be the influence of the socialist movements of Western Europe, not only upon Europe itself but upon the entire world, if these movements would seek an unequivocal end to the ~~the~~ ^{race}, if they would seek a settlement with Russia under which both the Warsaw Pact and the NATO alliances would be dissolved. The British nuclear force, though impressive when measured against that of France, is still essentially useless in a period when Soviet and American nuclear force will continue to dominate the world military situation and when the British nuclear force, ~~does not even constitute~~ ^{does not even constitute} some kind of balance of power. England would be in a far stronger position, both in terms of blocking the nuclear armament of Germany and in terms of playing a more significant role with the neutral world if she were to totally and unilaterally abandon her nuclear force. Such a step would greatly strengthen the democratic forces in West Germany and would end for all time the criminally irresponsible efforts of the United States Government to arm the nations of Europe with a "Multi-lateral Nuclear Force."

It is time for a serious discussion of the various Polish proposals to create a demilitarized zone in Central Europe. It is time to seek the neutralization of both East and West Germany as the possible basis for the ultimate unification of Germany as a demilitarized state. The freedom of Berlin can only, finally, be guaranteed within a context of a settlement of the German issue and an acceptance by the United States of the situation in East Europe. Paradoxically, to the degree the West accepts the present pattern of Eastern Europe and guarantees the Oder-Neisse boundary for Poland, we speed the process of independent action by the East European states. It is the rearmament of Germany and the continued talk within Germany about regaining her "lost territories in the East" which has kept Poland so dependent upon the Soviet Union. We declare our full support for those German socialists who oppose the rearming of Germany and who seek to end the German tradition of militarism and nationalism -- a tradition revived in the present situation by the actions of the U.S.

Developments in East Europe require new and flexible approaches. Moscow's influence is lessening. There are some real steps toward freedom that have taken place in Poland, in Yugoslavia and, even, in Hungary. To the degree that the NATO and Warsaw Pacts can be dismantled, the process of democratization will be speeded, and both U.S. and Soviet influence will lessen within Europe while the nations in Eastern Europe will move into closer relationships with the nations of Western Europe. With the lessening of U.S. - Soviet influence we shall also expect that in both East and West Europe there will be significant new moves toward democratic socialism.

We have been greatly encouraged by developments within Russia. The present Sino-Soviet split now leaves the Communist movement with three major "centers" -- Moscow, Peking, Belgrade -- and has permanently shattered the illusion of a monolithic world communist movement. More important, the split offers real hope that with competing centers of communist power the various local Communist parties and governments will find new freedom of action and hopefully will begin a new evaluation of the need to democratize their systems. The courage of Soviet artists and intellectuals has done much to help soften the harshness of the Soviet political landscape, and the refusal of these brave men and women to be silenced would indicate reason for believing there will be continued progress toward introducing democratic forms into the Soviet Union. Such forms already exist to some extent in Yugoslavia, which, while still totalitarian in a formal sense, now enjoys a remarkable degree of freedom of expression. (We note with deep regret the continuing

(12) 7
restrictions on Milovan Djilas, and demand his release).

In no sense do we mean to indicate by these comments that the bureaucratic leaders of the Communist movement are moving toward democracy. No matter how sincerely these leaders may be dedicated to the welfare of the people under their control, they continue to hold to the position that Communism requires a single-party dictatorship. It is not the bureaucracy which is moving, but the people — workers, artists, students, intellectuals — who are moving from below, who push, in a sense, who lead, the Communist bureaucracies into new patterns. We are grateful to see that the economic and social changes that have occurred in the Soviet bloc have forced political modifications, and have lessened the adventurism of Soviet foreign policy. But we cannot rejoice until that day when democratic socialist parties can organize and operate freely within the Soviet Bloc to challenge the Communists for political leadership.

SPAIN, PORTUGAL:

We give our full and unreserved support to the democratic underground movements largely led by socialists — in Spain and Portugal. We greet these, our comrades, whose freedom and whose lives are daily risked in the work of overthrowing the regimes of Salazar and Franco. We condemn U.S. military aid to these nations and the continued reference to these nations as being part of the "free world."

C.I.A.

It has become necessary in any discussion of foreign policy to comment upon that extraordinary organization known as the Central Intelligence Agency. The C.I.A., a super-secret, multi-billion dollar undertaking, has come to constitute a State Department in its own right, taking actions that run counter to official U.S. policy. It has managed to make a liar out of two U.S. Presidents and our Ambassador to the UN. It has operated on a scale and with a ruthlessness and duplicity which fully match that of the worst period of the Comintern. It has also operated with a blatant stupidity which the Communists could not hope to equal. The C.I.A. is a joke — but it is a nasty, dangerous and criminal joke. We are unhappily aware that all major powers will maintain vast spy systems as long as they insist on believing that peace can be secured through military means. But the C.I.A. has never limited itself to the unhappy task of spying. It has bought and sold governments, it has hired assassins, paid for coups, and in general put its dirty little finger into every corner of the globe. We would suggest the United States either abolish the State Department or that it abolish the C.I.A.

That any agency of the government could have the kind of unchecked power which the CIA now enjoys is unthinkable in a democratic society and is sad, hard proof of how deeply the arms race has corrupted our nation, and of how real are the roots of bureaucratic totalitarianism in our own country.

SUMMARY

For too long Americans have seen the area of foreign policy as a field of conflict between the "free world" and "communist tyranny." The free world is less free than we like to admit, and increasingly the Communist world is less uniformly tyrannical than we have believed. In this new and changing world we have the opportunity to gain a new perspective on events. We live in a period of revolution, when the real war must be waged against our most ancient enemies: against any child's untimely death, against hunger's incessant pain, against the endless ache of winter's cold, against the dull fever of disease, against the animal darkness of ignorance and illiteracy. Communism is only a warped and aborted attempt to wage this war; it is the counterfeit revolution.

It is out of fear that we have seen totalitarianism rise, just as it is out of fear that we have blasphemed against our own intellects and rationality by creating weapons that might better have been forged in hell. The human race strains toward its own liberation but is caught up still in its past. Socialists call on all Americans to join us in helping to move mankind from the darkness of war and dictatorship, of poverty and hatred, into the radiance which man can construct if only he has the will to choose. We call our fellow citizens to a war without guns; to a war where our weapons shall be the informed heart and the compassionate mind; to a war sustained by the belief that within every man there is a hunger for freedom, that within every society there is the potentiality for justice.

from: David McReynolds, 5 Beekman St., Room 1025, NYC 38 - May 22, 1964

to: Party's Key List, members NC, etc.

Comrades,

My apologies for preparing a pre-convention discussion article so late that I must mail it personally to the key list to make sure it reaches any of you prior to the convention. To be as brief as possible, in order to cover a wide area:

CAUCUSES:

I agree with Mendelson's position as stated in a recent Hammer and Tongs. Caucuses have value when they are based on a real political division. The present division of the Party (into Realignment and Labor Party factions) over what political line it should pursue five or ten years from now — that is the work of political children, no matter how old they may be. There are a number of significant political questions before us, in both domestic and foreign policy, which have nothing to do with how we stand on realignment or the "Labor Party". A glance at the last convention will show how false the divisions really are. The Labor Party contained both the Party's old guard and its extreme left wing! To a slightly lesser extent the same "left-right" division held true for Realignment. Whenever the Party got around to discussing real issues, whether domestic or foreign, both caucuses split.

MEMO TO MILITANT REALIGNMENT FRIENDS

It is no secret that I am closer to the tactic of political realignment than to the Labor Party position. (Though I would never think, at this juncture, of organizing or joining a caucus on this issue). I have been disturbed at the internal confusion of the Realignment group — its ability to move in two directions at once while thinking it was going straight ahead. I want to raise with the younger and more militant comrades in Realignment the question whether they do not have an obligation — if they really understand the position of realignment — to challenge and politically to defeat some of their own leaders.

Realignment (unless it means a simple capitulation by socialists to liberal capitalism) can have value only if it is a radical position translated into terms and tactics the liberal can understand — only if it is seen as a tactic designed to bring us into working contact with those forces in our society that are progressive in character and which are in motion. Realignment — as a tactic — is an effort to lift the dead hand of dogmatism from socialism.

If this is the case, what is the significance of Irwin Suall and Max Shachtman and Alex Garber calling for a massive program of civil defense shelters, financed by the government? Does this demand bring us closer to Negroes in Harlem, who can't even get federal funds for decent housing, let alone for shelters? The support of Civil Defense may be sound (though frankly I consider it crackpot) but the point to keep in mind is that sound as the Garber-Shachtman-Suall position may be in one sense, it is a mill stone around our necks if we are trying to relate to the unemployed, to Negroes, to the peace movement, to the left wing of the Democratic Party.

Or, on the issue of Civil Rights, the Realignment leadership tends to urge a softening of the Civil Rights militancy in order not to damage chances of penetrating the "official establishment" and influencing it. To the degree this position seeps through to the realignment rank and file, it means the realignment comrades will be separated from the Negro struggle. This "counsel of moderation" shows through

most clearly in terms of the struggle between the Civil Rights and the trade union movement. Now, nothing is more urgent than some sense of a Negro-Labor alliance. The job of socialists is to build that concept, to give it meaning. But this is not done by turning to the Negro movement and telling it not to rock the boat (ie., the nervousness with which some Realignment leaders greeted Herb Hill's attack on the ILGWU and their efforts to blunt the force of that attack). A real unity cannot be built or kept except on the basis of reality. And reality demands a head-on attack by the Party on certain sections of the trade union movement. Yes, we are for trade unionists and civil rights workers cooperating - without such cooperation we are doomed - but such cooperation must be on the basis of understanding that when it comes to real action there are sections of labor, including George Meaney, opposed to the kind of political and economic changes which must occur if the Negro is to become a full part of American society. In short, whether socialists like it or not we cannot fight for Civil Rights without fighting against a section of the trade union leadership. The Realignment people have done an outstanding job in the field of Civil Rights. But to the degree some of their leadership, by an outmoded reading of Marx, treats the trade union leadership as being above attack, to that degree does the Realignment position in fact separate itself from the real struggle.

In the area of foreign policy there are issues such as the Vietnam War, where Comrades Shachtman and Suall have expressed their dismay at the Party's demand for a withdrawal of U.S. troops. I do not want to argue here over whether or not the Party's position was correct - I only want to point out that the position of remaining in Vietnam does not speed realignment. Who, after all, are we trying to realign with? Johnson? McNamara? They are charming men. But do we really see them as the leaders of a progressive upheaval within the Democratic Party? Incidentally, I think Comrade Shachtman, who has been bitterly and consistently opposed to the foreign policy statements adopted by the Party at its last convention, and who complained of the lack of proper internal discussion in the Party on this area, has an obligation to set forth his own views and to explain how (and whether) his position on matters such as Vietnam and Civil Defense relate to realignment.

Realignment tied to a left political program makes sense. But Realignment tied to a right wing program alienates us from everyone except those conservative forces in the Democratic Party which, theoretically, we are trying to unseat in the first place. Moral: the younger comrades in the Realignment group ought to re-examine their political leadership or else form a caucus which does not so obviously combine contradictory goals.

A NOTE IN PASSING

Knowing I will alienate some friends and comrades, I still would suggest that all the old copies of Labor Action, New International, the collected works of Trotsky and Lenin, etc., either be buried or, if the bonds of sentiment are too deep, that they be placed on the very very top of our bookshelves, out of the reach of YPSL members and others who should be reading current materials first, who should be confronting the confusions and complexities of this decade and this country, before plunging backward into that marvelous, clear, vibrant and sectarian past.

ROLE OF PARTY

We are a very small organization. We cannot direct great events. Our real responsibility is two fold. First, we must be the center of genuine, democratic

and radical dissent. This does not mean we are called upon, because we are small, to be embittered and dogmatic. The Left always has a tendency to become shrill when it tries to speak up and that tendency must be avoided. I am not calling for simple re-statements of the moral values of socialism, but for probing analysis of current political, social and economic problems. By and large other groups tend to do a better job of this than we do. Students for a Democratic Society, Studies on the Left, New Politics, Monthly Review, Liberation - each, in a different way, does more new thinking and creative thinking than the Socialist Party seems to manage. There are intellectuals around - the Party must work harder to attract and involve them.

If the Party has a special obligation, in view of its small size, to be more open to dissenting views, to feel easier about having left and right wing viewpoints expressed in New America, etc., it has a second responsibility: it must carry socialist views, socialist values, socialist analysis into the mass movements. It is not at all enough for us to run a good forum series or a good newspaper or magazine. Socialists must be involved in arena work - in civil rights, trade union, peace work - and involved as open and responsible socialists. Our job is not simply to transmit esoteric intellectual theories to other intellectuals, but to make these theories meaningful to those persons in the society as a whole. We are not in a position to lead these organizations, but we can give them a certain tone or flavor, we can infuse a kind of political consciousness which is so desperately needed in the peace movement, in civil rights work, in trade unions.

NEW ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS?

For years I have been one of those who has said that, when the Party was so small as it is, then organization per se became a political issue - that all other questions must be subordinate to building the organization. I still feel this, but think now we must be more experimental. The organizational forms of the SP come from another period. They do not fit our needs today. We are now all agreed that with rare exceptions we are not going to run candidates. We are all agreed our Party will not be the nucleus around which "the" mass socialist party will form - that we can only help point the way, prod forces into motion, etc. But our Party organization is a holdover from the days when we did run candidates and when our Locals and Branches did serve as the nucleus in various communities for mass action - when civil rights and peace work, for example, was carried on by the Party itself.

To the degree our people must now work for peace, civil rights, etc., outside of the Party, we find our best and most active comrades do not have time to attend Branch meetings. The routine work of Branches and Locals is becoming increasingly meaningless in some areas, and no longer involves our active and youthful cadres. We must develop new organizational forms. On a recent two week trip to the Midwest, I found the Party most alive and vital in Indianapolis, where there is no organized Local. Don and Charlie Anderson were involved in local Democratic Party politics (theoretically they are "Labor Party" but theory must yield to reality), they were in close touch with the Civil Rights movement and about to launch a local CORE, they had a solid group of kids around them, and they had good contacts over half the state of Indiana - but they had no Local.

Branch life can become static, meaningless, a sterile form. Let us experiment, area by area, with those forms of organization that keep our people in touch without asking that they invest valuable and limited time in meaningless organizational forms. Of course, in those areas where more formal organization works,

by all means it should be maintained. We have had success with such fairly "new" forms as our ~~xxx~~ two educational forums in Washington. The special Party "camps" in Michigan (whatever we called them) which Irwin Suall set up worked very well. In any event, to be effective in the present period we shall have to break with whatever forms of the past prove cumbersome.

TOWARD A STALINOID TENDENCY

Nothing defines the rigid, inflexible, and essentially hysterical anti-Communism of the Party more clearly than the all pervasive use of the term "Stalinoid" within the Party. These remarks, the most controversial aspect of what I have to say, are sure to be misunderstood and to set off a chain of discussion, and I anticipate it will be some time before I can make my position fully clear to comrades who may be reacting emotionally and not logically to the points I am trying to make.

Stalinism can be defined. So can Leninism. And Trotskyism. And, if the word "Stalinoid" applied to those who, unwittingly or wittingly, supported the policies of the Stalinists, then I suppose the term would make sense. (Even so, I tend to resist this introduction of "oids" into a political situation already confused with "isms", "ists", and even "ites", i.e., is the correct usage Trotskyism, Trotskyist, or Trotskyite - or, perhaps, particularly in some sections of our own Party, is the term Trotskyoid most correct?) I have asked all of my friends and comrades to define the term "Stalinoid" for me, so that I might understand it with precision and use it with clarity. After a number of such discussions on the term I can report with authority that the term Stalinoid means: (a) One who supported the policies of Stalin but never joined the Communist Party (b) One who still supports the policies of Stalin and has been expelled from the Communist Party (c) One who opposed the policies of Stalin but never read New International (d) One who was too young to be politically active during the period of Stalin, but who supports Khrushchev (by this logic, those born too late to know much about Lenin and who grew up during Stalin's period and supported Stalin, ought to be called Leninists) (e) One who opposes Khrushchev but supports Mao (g) One who opposes both K. and Mao but supports Castro (h) One who opposes all Communist regimes but opposes nuclear war with them (i) Anyone under 25 years old who considers himself a radical but doesn't belong to any organized socialist group (j) Anyone over 25 years old who calls himself a "left liberal", who opposes Johnson, who opposes Communism, but who doesn't belong to the Socialist Party (such persons are known as "Stalinoids with a left-liberal orientation" and can be saved if recruited in time).

Now, in view of this confusion, and because the term has been so widely used, the time has come to define it once and for all. And this is easily done. The best way to define a term is to let someone step forward and accept the term and he then, by the operation of Natural Law, becomes the person able to define it. Oddly enough, while there are persons willing to be identified by Leninists or Trotskyists or even, occasionally, Stalinists, no one thus far has stepped forward and admitted to being Stalinoid.

I do therefore now and for all time define that word by accepting it. As the one and (to my knowledge) only official Stalinoid I define the word as follows:

- (1) A Stalinoid is someone who opposes Stalin. And Khrushchev. And Mao.
- (2) A Stalinoid believes that Stalin died, that he was buried in the flesh, on the right hand of Lenin, that he was resurrected briefly to be buried a second time, that after the second burial there is no resurrection. According to the Stalinoid calendar Stalin died in 1953 - eleven years ago.

- (3) A Stalinoid opposes all governments even in Cuba or in Florida or elsewhere which deny full democratic process to the citizen. A Stalinoid is opposed to Cuba trying to overthrow the State of Florida. A Stalinoid is opposed to the C.I.A. trying to overthrow the government of Cuba. A Stalinoid would disband all secret police, even in the United States.
- (4) A Stalinoid is publicly and strongly opposed to the limits on Djilas' freedom in Yugoslavia. Stalinoids care about the freedom of Djilas. Stalinoids also are publicly and strongly opposed to the arrest and imprisonment of political opponents in the United States, including not only the Communists, but the 392 young men sent to Federal prisons as draft resisters (8 of whom are in jail as this is written).
- (5) A Stalinoid believes that Mr. K. is a charming man, that he holds his vodka well, is a devoted husband and doting father, that he is an indulgent grandparent and that he has the interests of the Russian people at heart, and, like the late President Kennedy, Guy Mollet, President Johnson, and most other world leaders, he is responsible for murder. A Stalinoid believes that only those who oppose Mr. K. openly and vigorously have the moral right to attack LBJ. But, by the same token, Stalinoids think people who praise the politics of LBJ should carry their error all the way and praise the politics of Mr. K.
- (6) A Stalinoid thinks there are some proposals Mr. K. makes which are good. A Stalinoid thinks there are some proposals LBJ makes which are good. General opposition doesn't mean blind opposition.
- (7) A Stalinoid is one who wept when Budapest fell. A Stalinoid marched and shouted in a vain and tragic fury at every Soviet Embassy and Consulate in the world. But Stalinoids are not sorry when they hear things are improving in Hungary. He does not want things to get worse and worse; he hopes they will continue to get better and better.
- (8) A Stalinoid is one who thinks Guy Mollet is responsible for more people dying than Tito can claim; who thinks Guy Mollet helped Mr. K. smash the Hungarian Revolution (by choosing that instant to invade Egypt). If Stalinoids were asked who they would prefer in a socialist international - Tito or Mollet - they would say neither belonged in a democratic socialist international, but Mollet belonged even less than Tito.
- (9) A Stalinoid is unhappy about a lot of things that are happening in Egypt, Algeria, Cuba, Ghana. But Stalinoids think Ben Bella, Nasser, Castro, Nkrumah can do a better job of running these countries than the leaders of France, England, Israel, and the United States. Most of all, Stalinoids think the peoples of these countries could do the best job if they had the chance and so Stalinoids support all internal developments toward greater democracy in these countries and are critical of developments limiting such democracy.
- (10) A Stalinoid believes most people in Russia support Mr. K. Stalinoids think this shows how misguided most of the Russians are. Stalinoids believe most people in the United States support LBJ. They believe this shows how misguided the Americans are. George Meany thinks American labor is free labor and Soviet labor is slave labor. George Meany is not a Stalinoid. Stalinoids think there is no more slave labor in Russia.

Okay - the point is clear and enough is enough. My point is simply a lot of things have changed in the past ten years, even in the Soviet Bloc.

We are confronted with a monolithic world movement which is not monolithic anymore, which has Rumanian neutralists and Yugoslav revisionists and Albanian Stalinists and Chinese Trotskyists and God knows what else. We are confronted with a Communist world which now contains within its ranks intellectuals, writers, etc., who are both Communists and also are demanding a greater degree of freedom. What shall our relationship be to Polish and Soviet Communists who are opposing their own Communist bureaucracies? For my own part, as a genuine Stalinoid, I extend a fraternal and comradely hand to them, and count them as allies in a kind of world wide struggle for man's liberation.

The Soviet State is shoddy, dishonest and anti-human. So is ours. Change is occurring - not from the top down - and that change seems permanent.

I am appalled at the kind of continuing anti-Communism which corrodes and, frankly, perverts the socialist movement. Why are some of our leading members hesitant or even opposed to the Party's taking a sharp stand against the utterly indefensible U.S. slaughter in South Vietnam? Why can we get full unity only if we are protesting a Soviet action?

Why does our Party give more space to a discussion of the evils of Castro than it ever gave to a discussion of the evils of Batista? Particularly when Castro, for all his faults, is a lot better and has much wider support than Batista?

I'm not interested in opening the ranks of the Party to apologists for the Soviet state. (Though to be frank if we can be broad enough on the "right" to swallow the Boulder Local, I don't know why we can't absorb an equal number of comrades from that other part of the political "right" - the pro-Soviet apologists). What I am really concerned about is opening the mind of the Party.

I want to have a critical but friendly attitude toward the "state socialisms" developing in areas of Africa and Latin America. I want to establish contacts with the Communists in the Soviet Bloc - handful that they are - who really are prepared for open discussion. In many respects I am more interested in the development of workers councils in Yugoslavia than in whether or not the castrated West German Socialists win the next election.

These things make up the "Stalinoid" position. If I am nominated for the N.C. I will accept the nomination and run - for one reason only. The comrades should have the right to vote on this political position, knowing that I shall continue to present it in the months to come.

Fraternally,

David McReynolds

SOCIALISM REAFFIRMED

By Ken Burg and Mike Muench, Chicago

A major conflict between the "right" and "left" wings in the Socialist Party has been in a dispute over the basic purpose and orientation of the party. This dispute is most sharply illustrated as it was presented in the YPSL.

Michael Harrington and Joan Parnes (Suall) representing the PAC majority, wrote a YPSL perspectives resolution for the 1959 convention which is essence advocated that the YPSL become the student movement for peace, civil liberties, and civil rights. In order to carry put this perspective, Anvil, the YPSL reiteration of its sectarian favor and Challenge, the YPSL propaganda newspaper, would become the YPSL's only public voice.

Sy Landy chose this opportunity to make a "left-wing" attack on Harrington. He pointed out that if Harrington's perspective were carried out left wing politics would cease to exist on the campus, and that the YPSL would be attempting the impossible task of making itself into the organization of a student liberalism. He maintained that the existence of a large radical movement was impossible, and that slow "high level" recruitment and internal education designed to produce socialist cadre were all that socialist could hope to accomplish. Apathy not an upsurge of radicalism was the order of the day according to Landy. Consequently, he argued, Challenge was practically useless while Anvil filled the bill.

The "left" won this fight, but the "right" controlled the PAC. Thus the ironic end to this fight was that Harrington and company were handed the task of putting out Anvil! But the actual enthusiasm for Anvil was less than the convention vote on the matter indicated, and it became impossible for the "right" to put out the magazine which the "left" had said it wanted.

In retrospect, the sad aspect of the 1959 discussion is that both of the tendencies were largely correct in their criticisms of each other. Harrington and Parnes wanted to build a large left-liberal youth organization. Quite aside from the question content of our politics to do this, it is clear that the potential for this perspective did not exist.

Since 1958 the S.P. has attempted to operate with an orientation similar to the Harrington-Parnes proposal. Modest gains were made for a few years, largely due to the enthusiasm generated by the unity of the S.P., S.D.F., and ISL, and later due to the publication of a regularly appearing newspaper for the first time in a number of years. In the last year, however, both the America circulation and party membership have dropped sharply, despite the fact that the expansion of the civil rights movement has provided openings of the left which should have afforded the party better

opportunities for growth than it has had since the middle and the late 1940's. We feel that the party's decline can only be explained by the fact that the party has largely muted the distinctly socialist character of its politics.

The Left wing has counter posed to this position a position which may be summarized as follows:

- 1: Ever since McCarthyism, the American left has been small and fragmented.
- 2: The working class and its organizations are on the defensive, yielding to blows from automation the one hand and to the pressures of the cold war on the other.
- 3: Thus the working class has become conservatized, and its leadership successfully binds it to the Democratic Party politically.
- 4: Until there is a substantial change in the American economic and political scene, the left will, on the whole, be isolated from the mainstream of American life.

5: Upon a shift in the condition of America large sections of American society and of the working class in particular will be forced to politically break from the Democratic Party. This break will provide a new opening for a radicalization of American politics.

Unfortunately, many of our comrades have grown accustomed to drawing another conclusion from this analysis

6: Until this break from this the Democratic Party takes place, the Socialist movement will remain small, fragmented, and impotent.

It follows from this that the socialist movement cannot recruit and maintain a large membership, and must consider itself largely a "holding operation" anticipating better days to come. We have therefore placed ourselves in an ivy walled telephone booth to bide our time until "objective conditions" change, and we are handed a fighting and militant working class party on a silver platter.

What these "left wingers" have failed to recognize is that American political apathy is not in general simply a reflection of the fact that Americans are perfectly happy and contented with their lot. It is common knowledge that Americans are afraid of war; that youth despise the draft; that the threat of unemployment plagues every American worker; that the spread of industrial farming plagues every remaining small farmer; that the blight and chaos of uncontrolled urban development is an annoyance to the residents of every city; that shoddy merchandise and deceptive packaging is an annoyance to every consumer.

Apathy in America is no feeling of contentment, it is a feeling that nothing can be done about our social problems. It is this precisely because of this nothing can be done feeling that there have been no social struggles and movements to improve the situation. Negroes and their white allies have developed an awareness that they can do something, and, no doubt, by persistent struggle they will eventually succeed in eliminating much of the discrimination now imposed upon the nonwhite population. But in terms

of these other problems, the instincts of the American people are, on the whole, quite valid. The American people see no alternatives between the Western capitalist and the "communist" block. Quite rightly they do not see the American "Peace" movements as an alternative, for the peace movements can only plead with the ruling powers that they ought to be more Christian toward each other. Lacking any alternative, it is quite reasonable to assume that they support the American War camp. From this they must reluctantly support the draft, for if you support the international status quo then you must, even if begrudgingly, support the continued existence of the draft. What can you do about unemployment? Very little. Public works programmes help a little, but what with automation and improved technology it doesn't take as many persons to build roads, subways, schools, dams, and housing as it used to. Retraining courses also help, but the truth of the matter is that there are more available workers than there are available jobs. The change over to industrial farming is irrevocable. The huge and expensive machines used in farming enable efficient farming of huge areas; since these machines cannot be put to maximum use on and unprofitable. The only "out" for the small farmer under capitalism would be cooperation in farming, and even this would be a very radical step indeed.

The problem of urban blight seems no more solvable. Corporations will not remain in or move to a given city unless they can locate where they want to, and receive favor tax status. As the pattern of the industry changes, the pattern of housing changes, as the pattern of housing changes, as the pattern of housing changes the transportation changes, and as the pattern of housing and transportation changes, the location and distribution of retail and wholesaling outlets changes. No "city plan or" building code" has substantially altered this situation, and given economic

necessity of appearing business interest, it seems unlikely that anything can be done, beyond the level of building bigger roads and enforcing anti-smoke laws, and what can be done about shoddy merchandise and deceptive packaging? The latter problem may be somewhat alleviated by law. But it would be difficult indeed to set standards as to what is "fair packaging" and what is not. How can you say objectively whether the shape of a certain container is "fair" or whether it is allowable for a corporation to say on the package if its product the contents are "new" "last longer" wear better than over?

To eliminate shoddy "planned obsolescence" in products would require legislation far more restrictive than even the Blue Eagle era legislation which the Supreme Court threw, much to the annoyance of a statist FDR. Today cooperation would certainly not tolerate such a drastic intrusion by "Big Government" on the scarce right of free enterprise.

All of this goes to say that the political frustration of the American People is quite reasonable, for there are basically correct in thinking that nothing can be done under capitalism. ~~The~~

The Socialist movement, is unique, in that it is the only

political force which can offer a real and visible alternative to the political and economic problems of American society. Socialism would not be heaven on earth, but the system would allow for tremendous improvement of the present problems of American society.

Our isolation from the working class and the real world in general has led us to misinterpret the apathy we see. Given the political and economic conditions underlying this apathy, it is possible to recruit many more people to the socialist movement.

It is quite true that "we cannot offer these people anything" - at least not in the sense that we can put more food in their mouths next week if they sign up today. But to think that average Americans cannot be interested in working to attain goals which they cannot teach for awhile is to seriously underestimate them. People are not universally nearsighted. People will work for what they want, and what people in general want is not always an immediate material gain for themselves.

In conclusion we propose a socialist movement which attempts to recruit by presenting to the general public its radical alternative to class society. We do not advocate merger with the Socialist Labor Party, for we do not propose that the Socialist movement cease to relate to the immediate needs and demands of the American working people. But we do propose that in order to build any sort of socialist movement, we must do so largely on the basis of discussing the needs and struggle for socialism.

Such a reorientation of our movement will not result in a massive SP and YPSL. The lack of struggle even where it might be successful in many areas is an indication that we shouldn't hope for too much. But we do think that such a perspective could increase the size and strength of our movement to a great extent. We think that our perspective is realistic. We may be wrong. But we know for certain that we can't do any worse than we will do by adhering to the holding-operation theory. The best we can do with a holding operation is to hold; the best we can do with a-x in a phone booth is make a phone call.

No. 4, 1964

Worker Solidarity & Struggle

Socialist Party, USA